

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 13, 16, 20, 24-26, and 30-37 have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns. Claims 1-37 remain in the application.

Reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 7 for an informality. Applicant has amended claim 7 to address this issue.

In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 13 for an informality. Applicant has amended claim 13 as requested by the Examiner.

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 30 due to an informality. Applicant has amended claim 30 as requested by the Examiner.

Withdrawal of the objections for claims 7, 13, and 30 is respectfully requested.

In Section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1-24 under 35 USC 112, 1<sup>st</sup> ¶ as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this statement as Applicant believes that one of ordinary skill in the art would easily understand the meaning of the claim language, particularly in light of the description of operation within the specification. However, as Applicant is amending claim 1 to address the USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> ¶ issues, Applicant has amended claim 1 to further clarify and define his invention to address this issue. Claim 1, as amended, now reads as:

1. An optically addressable display comprising:  
a projection device including,  
a mechanism to create emissions having plural polarizations,  
*wherein the number of polarizations defines a corresponding*  
*number of color channels; and*  
a data encoder to apply data for each of the color channels to  
corresponding ones of the plural polarizations; and  
a screen including,  
a plurality of pixels for producing a color display; and  
a plurality of receptors including at least one receptor for each  
of said plurality of pixels *responsive to a corresponding polarization*  
*state for each of the color channels*, said plurality of receptors  
activating *a corresponding color channel* of said pixels depending  
upon which, if any, of the *emissions having a corresponding*  
*polarization state* is received.

Claim 1, as amended, now includes the limitations where "*the number of polarizations*" of the plural polarizations defines "a corresponding number of color channels" and "a plurality of receptors including at least one receptor for each of said plurality of pixels *responsive to a corresponding polarization state for each of the color channels*, said plurality of receptors activating a *corresponding color channel* of said pixels depending upon which, if any, of the *emissions having a corresponding polarization state* is received." Thus, it is not that the pixel is activated when emissions having plural polarizations is received, but rather that a corresponding color channel of the pixel is activated when an emission having a corresponding polarization state is received. Support for these limitations is found throughout the specification and in particular, the summary and page 12, lines 19-21. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112 1<sup>st</sup> ¶ for claims 1-24 is respectfully requested.

In Section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-37 under 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> ¶ as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the detailed description of the problems and the recommended clarifications. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 3, 20, 24, 5, 7, 16, 25, and 31-36 as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> ¶ is respectfully requested.

In Section 10 of the Office Action, claims 25-30, 34, and 36 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Naito (U.S. 6,356,251). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 25 as amended reads as:

25. A method of encoding color data to activate an optically addressable display including a plurality of pixels, the method comprising the steps of:  
 at a projection device:  
     producing emissions having different polarizations;  
     **for each pixel**, applying data to each of said emissions having different polarizations by selectively passing said emissions having different polarizations to said pixels;  
 at the optically addressable display:  
     **at each pixel**,  
     responding to each of said emissions having different polarizations with a corresponding receptor; and  
     producing a different display for each of said emissions having different polarizations when responded to by the corresponding receptor.

Claim 25, as amended, specifically states that "**for each pixel**," data is applied "having different polarizations by selectively passing said emissions having different polarization to said pixels." Further, claim 25 includes "**at each pixel**," "responding to each of said emissions having different polarizations with a corresponding receptor, and producing a different display for each of said emissions having different polarizations when respond to by the corresponding receptor." Naito, on the other hand, teaches not having transmitters "for each pixel" but rather transmitters for each column or row of pixels on the edge of the display. Further Naito does not teach receptors "at each pixel" as Applicant is claiming but rather along the edge of the display and thus for a group of pixels. Naito is concerned with how to drive a high density array of pixels rather than individual pixels themselves. The polarization encoding of Naito is used to prevent interference between adjacent signal transmission paths (col. 2, lines 12-21) and not to produce "*a different display for each of said emissions having different polarizations when responded to by the corresponding receptor.*" According to MPEP 2143.03, all claim limitations must be considered. MPEP 2141.02 and *Graham v. Deere*, the differences between the prior art cited and the claimed invention must be ascertained. The claimed invention "as a whole" must be considered as well as the prior art "as a whole." It is the inventor's insight that a different polarization could be used for each color on a pixel by pixel basis to activate the pixels that is contrary to use of different polarizations used to prevent interference between adjacent signal transmission paths to an array of pixels. Accordingly, Applicants claim 25 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Naito. Accordingly, claim 25 is believed patentable over Naito. Claims 26-30 and 34 depend on claim 25 and are believed at least patentable based on the patentability of claim 25, as amended and argued above.

Claim 36 has a similar limitation as claim 25 in that "**at each pixel**, *receptor means responsive to each of the plural polarization states; and means for actively producing plural color displays, one for each of the plural polarization states.*" This limitation is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Naito. Naito instead teaches for a group of pixels receptor means responsive to just one of the plural polarization states (to avoid interference with the adjacent transmitter) and not *one*

for each of the plural polarization states. Accordingly claim 36 is believed patentable over Naito.

Claim 37, as amended reads:

5           37. An optically addressable display comprising:  
          **at each pixel,**  
          *means for receiving emissions having a plurality of*  
          *polarizations, each of the plurality of polarizations corresponding to a*  
10           **separate color** data channel wherein data is encoded onto each of  
          the separate color data channels; and  
          means for actively producing plural color displays, one for  
          each of the plurality of polarizations of received emissions.

15           Accordingly, claim 37 is claiming "at each pixel" having means for receiving  
          emission having a plurality of polarizations. Naito teaches for a group of pixels  
          means for receiving one of a plurality of polarizations. Naito does not also teach  
          that "each of the plurality of polarization corresponding to a **separate color** data  
          channel." Rather Naito teaches that each of the plurality of polarizations  
20           corresponds to adjacent data channels for different group of pixels. Accordingly,  
          claim 37, as amended, is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Naito.

          Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) for claims 25-30, 34, 36  
          and 37 is respectfully requested.

25           In Section 11 of the Office Action, the specification was objected to  
          because of the following matters: "emissions of polarizations." Particularly, the  
          Examiner requested the Applicant to revise the specification to change "emissions  
          of polarizations" to "emissions having polarizations." Applicant has done so for  
          the claims but was unable to find such a phrase "emissions of polarizations" in the  
          specification. The specification already was written as "emissions having  
30           polarizations" and thus the amended claims now conform to the specification and  
          no new matter has been entered. If the Examiner is aware of a particular portion  
          of the Specification which includes this phrase "emissions of polarizations," she is  
          welcome to contact the Applicant's attorney, Tim Myers, to discuss changes.  
          Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

35

Applicant believes his claims as amended are patentable over the art of record, and that the amendments made herein are within the scope of a search properly conducted under the provisions of MPEP 904.02. Accordingly, claims 1-37 are deemed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the Application other than in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should such fees be associated with an extension of time, Applicant respectfully requests that this paper be considered a petition therefore.

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Legal Department  
1000 NE Circle Blvd.  
Corvallis, OR 97330  
Telephone: (541)715-4197  
Fax: (541)715-8581

Respectfully Submitted,

Gregory J. May

By: 

Timothy F. Myers

Patent Attorney

Registration No. 42,919